

Ellie, that was a wonderful introduction and I'm truly flattered. It's amazing to have you as a close friend and collaborator. I also very much want to thank the awards committee, Jennifer Aaker, Frank Kardes, and Joel Huber for selecting me for this award. It means a great deal to me.

I've given a lot of thought to what I want to say here, since, after all, it's rare to have such a venue to give thanks and share my thoughts on my own research and the field at large. I considered a review of research successes to date and a plan for future research, but instead I've decided to focus on something I think is a bit more interesting: what leads to success in the first place.

I doubt that the dichotomy of dispositional and situational attribution is foreign to the people in this room, but since it is the thrust of what I will be talking about, let me quickly summarize. For any outcome, whether it is positive or negative, we can attribute its cause to the individual to whom it occurred, or, instead, to other external factors that contributed to the outcome. For example, when a paper is published, we can attribute that to the authors, a dispositional attribution, or to a lucky reviewer draw, a situational attribution. Both may play a role in publication likelihood, but the different attributions carry very different consequences. If we give credit to the authors, they are held in high regard and promoted. If we give credit to the favorable reviewer draw, we downplay the authors' intellect.

I mention all of this, because when a society such as ours issues awards, they are implicitly assuming that the cause of a recipient's success is dispositional in nature. That is, we don't typically reward someone we think was just lucky. Rather, we reward those we think worked harder or were more productive than others. Today, I'd like to argue that though dispositional factors surely do play a role in the success of those of us being honored today, it is actually situational factors that likely contributed far more to our successes than we typically consider.

To that end, I'd like to spend a few minutes highlighting some of the external factors that led me to be standing in front of you today. It's worth starting at the very beginning. For instance, I was fortunate enough to have

been born to two parents who were caring, loving and, important to my chosen profession, placed an incredibly high value on education. That was not something I had any control of. Rather, fortune blessed me with being born well. Not too well, however, as I was born in Ukraine during the era of the Soviet Union where success was hard to come by for a non-connected family such as mine, especially one that was Jewish. But, again, circumstances outside of my control greatly helped me. My family made the difficult decision to break all ties with the life they knew and emigrated to the United States when I was 5 years old. Again, not my doing, but clearly my benefit. My parents and family sacrificed their friendships and familial ties to give me and my brother the opportunity to thrive. Not everyone has such an opportunity.

I again found myself the beneficiary of good fortune when I was enrolled in a top notch public education system in New York, not something afforded to all children by any stretch of the imagination. That education system gave me the tools necessary to be accepted to a world class university for my undergraduate studies, NYU. I freely admit that I worked hard to get to that point, but to believe that it was my doing alone that got me so far would be grossly arrogant. Following a short and unpleasant period working in Finance, I made the decision to pursue the study of consumer behavior as my life's work.

But even this decision to study consumer behavior came about largely by chance. When I applied to graduate programs, I had some vague notion of wanting to study marketing, but I really had no idea what that meant. I applied to 19 programs and hoped for the best. I was ultimately accepted to NYU's Marketing program and I very vividly remember receiving an email from Vicki Morwitz, the then head of the Marketing PhD program, asking me to provide her with my top three faculty that I would like to complete a research practicum with during my first year in the program. Being the naive incoming student that I was, I told her that I didn't really have a preference and asked her to match me with someone as she saw appropriate. In hindsight, I fully realize how incredibly risky such a decision was.

However, as with the other examples, circumstances proved to work to my benefit. Vicki paired me with this new faculty member who I'd never heard of, Leif Nelson. At the time, I thought that research in marketing was all about the four Ps and 3 Cs. Leif quickly broke that illusion and introduced me to the world of social psychology and how it applies to consumer behavior. To that point, I had never read a research article nor taken a psychology course. Leif put me through a very intense crash course in psychological research and I quickly fell in love with the discipline. It was this chance pairing with Leif that really started my career.

Shortly thereafter in a chance encounter, Justin Kruger, newly hired to NYU at the time, happened to be using the urinal next to mine in the restroom on our floor. He somewhat awkwardly mentioned that he had a floundering project with George Loewenstein looking at variety seeking behavior and wondered if I thought that was interesting. I hemmed and hawed as I finished my business, but then met him in his office and started on a series of projects that would ultimately become my dissertation and the origin of the bulk of the work I do today, specifically studying satiation. In fact, almost every collaboration I have had can be traced to some random chance encounter or circumstance where I happened to be at the right place at the right time.

As another example, I met my amazing wife and research collaborator, Rosalind Chow, when I was interviewing at CMU for a faculty position and she happened to fill in one of my meeting slots. She's a faculty member in Organizational Behavior and really had no business meeting with me, but was filling an open slot as a favor to the marketing group. Again, circumstances outside my control directly led to my benefit both in my personal life and my professional life as we have and continue to co-author papers.

This trend continued when I started working with my first graduate student, Yang Yang. I distinctly remember reviewing PhD applications with my colleague Joachim Vosgerou and seeing her CV. We were shocked that she already had two JCR publications BEFORE she even started the PhD program. We figured there was no way she'd ever join our tiny PhD

program, but, as it happens, her husband was in the process of earning his PhD in computer science at CMU and she immediately accepted our offer. We jointly went on to publish several papers and started an entirely new research program studying sentimental value.

My current student, Julian Givi, about to go on the job market, wink wink, also came to me by happy circumstance. Julian is a Pittsburgh native and had a desire to stay local for his PhD. He has turned me on to yet another research area, the psychology of Gift Giving, and we too have published several papers together. I had little to do with his preference for Pittsburgh, but I surely benefited from it.

As I hope is evident by now, I feel incredibly fortunate to have been the beneficiary of good luck and good circumstances. For me, this mostly manifest in the people that I was lucky to be surrounded by. For others, their good luck, I'm sure, comes in many flavors. The key takeaway is that if we all examine our own lives and our own successes, I believe it is imperative that we consider just how much chance influenced who we are. So while I am deeply thankful for this award, I must attribute much of it to the fortunate rolls of many dice and the key relationships and collaborations that resulted from this fortune.

Aside from my desire to emphasize the role of situational attributions in my own success, I also want to highlight the very real possibility that few, if any of you, likely spontaneously made such attributions for my having received this award. That is, I suspect that perhaps few here said "Jeff succeeded in his career, but really it's because he's just lucky and developed good collaborators." That, however, is largely because I am a heterosexual white man.

Indeed, perhaps the biggest situational attribute that led to my success is that I am a man in a field dominated by men. Now, I am incredibly happy that I share this award with a highly qualified woman and that the recipient of this year's Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award is also a talented and skilled woman. Unfortunately, however, as many of you know, the playing field for men and women is not even remotely level in academia.

You may be wondering why I bring up this issue of gender inequality today and the answer is quite simply that it is important and not nearly sufficiently discussed by our field. Moreover, it is not discussed by men nearly enough. Though women are the ones being discriminated against, that does not excuse men from having the responsibility to also be part of the conversation and part of the solution. To that end, given the opportunity to address all of you, I felt it my duty to do so as gender discrimination is something I am passionate about fixing.

In particular, as it relates to attributions of success, men are far more likely to be given credit at the expense of women. When a woman co-authors with a man, there is often a presumption that the man did the bulk of the work. Or perhaps the man provided the intellectual gravitas while the woman merely completed simple RA-like tasks. How often have we heard some version of: Oh, *she* co-authored with her advisor, obviously that's all the advisors doing. Or the flip: Oh, *he* co-authored with his advisor, sure but the advisor wouldn't continue to work with him unless he was really good. Don't believe just these anecdotes however. Recent research looking at attributions of contribution of authors in a variety of fields has shown just this: women receive less credit than men. We make dispositional attributions for men: he's talented, but situational ones for women: she's only successful because she had good co-authors.

This doesn't stop with beliefs about relative contribution. Women are invited to give fewer talks, even when controlling for base rates of women in various fields. Women are seen as being less competent than comparable males when on the job market. Women are offered lower salaries than men. Women receive recommendation letters that are shorter, use more hedging words, and contain more content about their personality relative to research than men do. Women are rated less favorably in their teaching evaluations than men. Women are asked to do more service work than men, which takes them away from time spent on research. Women are less likely to be granted tenure than men. And women are exposed to far more instances of sexual harassment and assault than men are.

The point is that academia, like the rest of the world, is a place where women are discriminated against, be it explicitly or implicitly. Lest you think that Marketing is somehow insulated from this problem, we are not. There are many metrics we can point to to demonstrate gender discrimination in our field, but here is just one. I looked at the top 10 business schools according to US News and World Report and counted the number of male and female Full Professors, since women are often under-represented at the tops of organizations. Of the 104 Full Professors at these 10 institutions, only 18, or about 17% are women. Our field lives with this problem just like every other discipline.

This, of course, begs the question of what we can do to fix this problem. After all, if we as a field desire to accept women as our equals, we must make sure that our institutions are set up to provide for equal opportunities and eliminate barriers for women. To the men out there: it is just as much our responsibility to help fix this problem as, more often than not, we are the ones causing it. Furthermore, men are often in positions of power that allow us to make change. Though I don't claim to have the silver bullet for this problem, research does tell us what can help.

First, be mindful of ingroups. When I nominate colloquium speakers at CMU it is easy to go to my network of friends and colleagues who happen to be mostly male. Instead, we should all break out of this practice and actively look to invite those who are outside of our immediate networks, with an emphasis on inviting women at equal rates to men. This is true not just for colloquium talks, but for conference sessions, job market invites, and so on.

Second, mentorship and sponsorship of junior colleagues needs to be systematic and deliberate. Evidence consistently shows that senior colleagues' support of junior colleagues is an instrumental component to success. Senior faculty in the room, invite your junior female colleagues to an exclusive conference. Nominate them to editorial review boards and for professional awards. Talk them up to your other senior colleagues at your institutions and at other institutions. Generally do what you can to get them the access that men seem to have automatically.

Third, don't create externalities that harm women. In our departments, when men are asked to do service tasks such as sit on the IRB or participate in a curriculum committee and men say no, the burden of doing this work falls to our female colleagues because societal norms constrain them from saying no to such work. This unfortunately creates a "tax" on women and results in women having fewer hours to spend on research than men. So step up to the plate and do your fair share of service work.

Fourth, and perhaps most important, don't stop talking about this issue. I understand that not everyone is comfortable talking about gender concerns and many of you are likely uncomfortable right now. Too bad. Being uncomfortable is not justification for discrimination. And that is what we are talking about here, discrimination. It may not be intentional but it is real. As academics we should be particularly well positioned to tackle gender discrimination head on. We believe in the value of evidence, not personal opinions. We believe in the value of correcting errors in the name of science and so we should apply that same standard here. Let's adopt the strategies that have been proven by research to reduce discrimination.

I want to conclude by acknowledging that this likely isn't the speech you expected from me, but it is the one I felt I could give with the greatest sincerity. I feel truly grateful to the multitude of people who helped me accomplish all that I have and I believe it is now my responsibility to return that help however I can. Today I hope I have done so by highlighting this problem that exists not just in the abstract, but very much in our midst. I am confident that if enough of us take a stand, we can successfully fight discrimination of any kind.

Thank you everyone for listening.